

# APPROVED MINUTES

## Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the Additional Regular Meeting of August 24, 2009

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Ann Quinley Secretary: Christine Lewis

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent Ab=Abstain A/=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance  
With N=Nay P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members for Final Review: September 11, 2009

Approved: September 14, 2009

1. Call to Order, Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance: 07:00 PM

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ANDERSON	SIMPSON	HOFER	VICK	BRITTSCH	ROBERTSON	QUINLEY	MONTROSS	LEWIS	HERIGSTAD	SMITH	WEAVER	RUDOLF	VANKOUGHNETT	BACHMAN
P	P	A	A-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P

Appendices to these Minutes: One (1) Attachment A- PDF document "GPU EIR Report to VCCPG on August 24, 2009"

Total Number of Pages Comprising this Report: Four (4)

Notes: Pledge of Allegiance – Brian Bachman

Quorum Established: 12

Yes (X) No ( )

2. Approval of Minutes: None submitted

3. Open Forum:

- a) **Jack Fox** – Asks that the Agenda of our next meeting on September 14 include a review and discussion of the project at Champagne Lake RV Resort. On August 13, DPLU issued a "Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration". It appears to him that the project has significant changes since it was first presented in September 2008. There are now 140 spaces or more – an additional 90 spaces. There is a Sept. 11 deadline for comment to the DPLU and he and his neighbors are concerned that there will not be an opportunity to comment.
- Smith** – We just received the paperwork and it has been given to Keith Robertson for review. I have been promised by the planner, Patrick Brown that if it is reviewed at our next meeting on September 14 and a report made to the DPLU on Sept. 15 that will be sufficient.
- Robertson** – will not be at the September PG meeting. Paul Herigstad will work with Keith and present the project at the September 14<sup>th</sup>. Regular PG meeting.

- b) **Nancy Layne** – Wanted to communicate her concern about the contentious nature of public meetings, newspaper articles, etc. and to emphasize that we are all neighbors and we are all here because we care about Valley Center.

4. Discussion Items - (No VCCPG advisory vote is to be taken)

- a) **Chairman Smith**- Brief announcement and clarification that the next VCCPG meeting on September 12 is a training meeting for PG members but is open to the public. The next PG meeting that will deal with regular Agenda items is as usual on the second Monday of the month, September 14<sup>th</sup>.

5. Action Items (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items)

- a) **Update on the Plan Amendment Authorization (PAA) that the Accretive Group intends to file on proposed 1900 home project on the west end of Valley Center; discussion and possible vote(s) regarding the potential impact of that project on Valley Center Planning (DPLU Manager, Advanced Planning, Devon Muto )**

**Note:** Hans Britsch recused himself from participation in this discussion since he owns property in close proximity to the area impacted by the proposed PAA.

**Devon Muto** - Purpose in coming this evening is to bring the proposed PAA to the attention of the community and be as transparent as possible in advance of formal filings. He is aware this is a project with a controversial history. On June 12, 2009 the Accretive Group had an Initial

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2009

San Diego County  
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

## APPROVED MINUTES

Consultation Meeting (ICM) with DPLU staff to build a Western Village concept which they call "Valley Center Sustainable Community". Much more information will be required to complete the process. The study area needs to be enlarged to include western Valley Center as a whole. The GP Update Committee is looking to reduce some of the densities in the North and South Villages and the associated traffic. This proposal has some relevance in the context of assigning some of that density to the Western Village Concept. Once the Plan Amendment Authorization (PAA) is submitted, DPLU has 45 days to officially respond either approving or rejecting the project. He would be happy to return at a future date to make additional comments or answer questions. Meanwhile, The VCCPG should refrain from taking a position on this issue until a formal application is made to DPLU and a formal response from the PG is required.

**Rudolf**- Wanted to comment that a recent meeting before the PG on the proposed EDCO recycling plant drew a huge crowd to discuss a controversial topic and that it was conducted in an incredibly civil manner. He encouraged tonight's speakers to be equally civil.

**Smith** – In the past we have had concrete elements to comment on well before any PAA was filed. This is the first occasion that such a large project in Valley Center has gone through the PAA process with no formal plans or specific concrete proposals put before the PG to study.

**Muto** – The PG will have 45 day window to comment and will have the usual time frame to review the plans. Within the past 2 years, DPLU has tried to be more pro-active and has broken the application process into 2 phases to get departments involved earlier. This phase is to get more feedback from the PG. We have done this on other PAA's just not in Valley Center.

**Smith** – I am very concerned that 45 days is not enough time to review a project this complicated. We are going to be faced with a "fait d'accompli".

**Muto** – You can have discussions with the proponent at any time.

**Herigstad** – Are there no plans at all that we can look at?

**Muto** – None. Just a map of the properties supplied by the Accretive Group (holds up Google photo with owned or optioned properties outlined in red and APN numbers noted) .

**Rudolf** – We have had the 45 day comment period extended in the past; for example, the Tavaréz project. When will the PAA actually be filed?

**Muto** – Appreciates that it will take more than 45 days to review the Project but when the PAA is submitted is entirely up to the applicant. The PAA is based on 400 acres. We will need to see the entire proposal and the larger area involved in order to reduce densities in the North and South Villages

**Rudolf** - The GP Update subcommittee is not in a position to bargain away densities on behalf of the community. Personally, I would like to see the densities go away.

### Comments & Questions from the public:

**Rachel Marquez**, (1751 West Lilac Rd) – This project will have a negative impact on our lives. The Accretive Group has been deceptive in its intentions on 3 occasions and this PAA is not a transparent process.

**Jim Bartell** – (Accretive Group) We have been holding several public meetings or workshops to gather input from the community.

**Edward Murray** (31439 Palos Verde Drive,) – Is a 35 year resident and is glad for the development which will improve their services and make them part of the community. In the past, the VCCPG didn't know we existed in west Valley Center and favored the building of a trash transfer station there which was opposed by local residents.

## APPROVED MINUTES

**Gerald Walson** (no address given) – What direction has been given to DPLU by Supervisor Horn regarding the West Village project?

**Muto** – There has been no direction from Supervisor Horn.

**Ray Ewing** (9241 Adam Ct.) – Opposed to increased density and finds the whole situation and discussion very confusing.

**Patsy Fritz**, (33265 Mill Creek Rd) – On July 23, 2008 the Board of Supervisors voted to remove this project entirely from the Draft Referral Map. The Accretive Group did not buy their property early enough to get this project in the pipeline before the GP Update. This PAA needs to be considered on its own merits and should be proposed, if at all, as a separate GPA. I am opposed to any special "study area" to shift density to Accretive project as it is in defiance of the Board of Supervisor's vote. Could champion the Accretive cause if they were able to make a buck by bringing vineyards to the area – 10 acre lots.

**Jack Fox** – Has attended both "art gallery" presentations put on by Accretive. It is a collection of disturbing mis-information making the public think they have water when they do not and sewer. The North County Inland Regional Leadership (NCIRL) is misleading not leadership. They are not taking feed-back. At their meeting earlier at Valley View there was no opportunity for attendees to respond to any claims or positions taken by the panel.

5b)

**Discussion and vote on the General Plan Update Subcommittee recommendations for the Draft EIR document. The document is available online at:**

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/gpupdate/environmental.html>

**Chairman Smith** – Compliments and gratitude to the GP Update Subcommittee and its Chairman, Rich Rudolf for massive effort in responding to County's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) some 3,000 pages in length. The report given here tonight represents extraordinary effort on behalf of the VCCPG.

**Rich Rudolf** – Thank you to GPU Subcommittee members, particularly Sandy Smith, who is here to review highlights and answer any questions from the PG. In addition to commenting on the DEIR, we were asked by the DPLU to recommend a MAP. We have essentially adopted the Environmentally Superior Map for the Villages and the Draft Land Use Map for the rural areas of VC. We have also approved the goal of 33,000, as projected population for 2030. This was adopted in 1998.

**Glavinic** – All the recommendations in the EIR are flawed. We still have many failing major roads. We should not plan for failure. We are "wimps" if we do not demand the County address the failures.

**Sandy Smith** – We followed the guidelines as outlined in attachment 1. We analyzed the population densities that would be created by using the BOS Draft Referral Map. This MAP will negatively impact Valley Center by adding a population of approximately 8,000 people to the North and South Villages. A full description is enclosed in the Recommendations. WE can continue to define the Mobility elements as we go back through our Community Plan before it is finally submitted to the County.

The Draft Land Use Map zoning places Bates Nut Farm on Woods Valley Road as SR4.

**Sherry Ness** (Bates Nut Farm) – the Farm's operation has evolved to a primarily commercial operation and now only grows pumpkins. They would like their zoning to remain as "rural commercial". They do not want the County to widen the road to 4 lanes.

**S. Smith** – We are recommending that the County accept LOS "E" as a designation for the road if it remains "rural commercial" because it could be widened otherwise.

**Chairman Smith** – If it goes to 4 lanes we are looking at "big box" stores coming.

## APPROVED MINUTES

**Robertson** – If we keep Woods Valley Road as 2 lanes, we can keep the “big box” stores out.

**Rudolf** – Personally not in favor of “rural commercial” but prefers keeping it as it is as a non-conforming use of SR-4.

**Ness** – We have always been zoned “rural commercial”.

**Chairman Smith** – There appears to be a discrepancy in information. Is Bates Nut Farm zoned as an SR 4 or as rural commercial?

**Rudolf** – Asks the particular question of Bates Nut Farm land use designation be removed from the Motion before the PG and be revisited during the revision of the Community Plan and resolve the issue that way.

### **Motion:**

“To Approve the following Recommendations and the attached GPU EIR Report submitted to VCCPG and previously approved by its GPU Subcommittee;

#### Approved Recommendations:

Approve the VCCPG - Recommended Alternative Project as the recommended Project Alternatives and/or Mitigation Measures for Valley Center in the Revised GPU and its EIR ;

1. Approve the recommendations from the Circulation subcommittee;
2. Approve the attached list of Comments on the Revised GPU EIR (Attachment 4);
3. Reaffirm the 1998 Board of Supervisors' approved population goal of 33,000 for the Valley Center Community Planning Area.
4. Temporarily remove from consideration, recommendations contained herein regarding classification of Wood's Valley Road and Bates Nut Farm for further clarification and resubmission at a later time.”

<b>Maker/Second</b>	Ann Quinley/Keith Robertson
<b>VOICE VOTE: (y-n-a)</b>	
12 -0 -0	
<b>Motion Passes without dissension</b>	

#### Note:

In addition, Chairman Oliver Smith asks that the County re-run the Valley Center Traffic Model based on the Recommended MAP(s) in the EIR Report so the Planning Group and its subcommittees will have more accurate information as they move forward to complete their work on the Valley Center Community Plan.

**For complete text and maps in the EIR Report refer to the PDFattachment to these minutes “GPU EIR Report” (Attachment A)**

### **5. Motion to Adjourn: 9:20 pm**

<b>Maker/Second:</b> Smith/Lewis	<b>Voice Vote (Y-N-A):</b> 12 - 0 – 0
----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Notes:</b>	<b>Motion Carries</b>
---------------	-----------------------

**Next Meeting: Saturday, September 12, VCCPG Training Meeting**

Respectfully Submitted,  
 Christine Lewis, Secretary  
 September 3, 2009  
 Revised Submission- September 11, 2009  
 Approved Submission – September 14, 2009